ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA643190**

Filing date: **12/08/2014**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Proceeding	92060249
Party	Defendant Dabes Ibrahim DBA Dabes Egyptian Imports
Correspondence Address	DABES IBRAHIM NEUBURGER STR 109 AUGSBURG, 86167 GERMANY
Submission	Answer
Filer's Name	Paul D. Bianco
Filer's e-mail	tmmiami@fggbb.com
Signature	/Paul D. Bianco/
Date	12/08/2014
Attachments	answer-409Opp.pdf(149852 bytes) exhibit a.pdf(898021 bytes)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

In re Registration No. 4,536,391
For the Mark: AMY DELUXE (design)
Registration Date: May 27, 2014

Mya Saray, LLC,	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	Cancellation No.: 92060249
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
Dabes, Ibrahim DBA	)	
Dabes Egyptian Imports,	)	
	)	
Registrant.	)	

ANSWER TO PETITION FOR CANCELLATION

Ibrahim Dabes, a citizen of the Federal Republic of Germany ("Registrant"), doing business as Dabes Egyptian Imports at Neuburger Str. 109, Augsburg 86167, Germany, by and through its undersigned counsel hereby answers the Petition for Cancellation of Mya Saray, LLC ("Petitioner") as follows:

1. Registrant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations set forth in Paragraph 1 of the Petition for Cancellation and therefore denies each and every allegation set forth therein.

2. Registrant denies the allegations set forth in Paragraph 2 of the Petition for Cancellation.

3. Registrant, in answer to Paragraph 3 of the Petition for Cancellation, admits that it obtained Registration No. 4,536,391 on May 27, 2014 in International Class 034 for the following goods: tobacco; smoking articles, namely, cigarettes, cigars,

smoking pipes, and shishas; but, denies that AMY DELUXE is merely "stylized." Although the terms "AMY" and "DELUXE" are stylized, the mark also consists of two white flourish designs appearing above and below said terms, all appearing on a background with a flattened oval and with a red outline.

4. Registrant admits that Petitioner is indicated in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office database as the owner of record for US Registration Nos. 3031439, 3031440, 3684311, 3684311, 3840577 and 3845276, but Registrant denies each and every allegation set forth in Paragraph 4 of the Petition for Cancellation for lack of information of Petitioner's ownership thereof with respect to any or all of the goods specified therein.

5. Registrant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations set forth in Paragraph 5 of the Petition for Cancellation and therefore denies each and every allegation set forth therein.

6. Registrant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations set forth in Paragraph 6 of the Petition for Cancellation and therefore denies each and every allegation set forth therein.

7. Registrant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations set forth in Paragraph 7 of the Petition for Cancellation and therefore denies each and every allegation set forth therein.

8. Registrant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations set forth in Paragraph 8 of the Petition for Cancellation and therefore denies each and every allegation set forth therein.

9. Registrant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief

as to the truth or falsity of the allegations set forth in Paragraph 9 of the Petition for Cancellation and therefore denies each and every allegation set forth therein.

10. Registrant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations set forth in Paragraph 10 of the Petition for Cancellation and therefore denies each and every allegation set forth therein.

11. Registrant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations set forth in Paragraph 11 of the Petition for Cancellation and therefore denies each and every allegation set forth therein.

12. Registrant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations set forth in Paragraph 12 of the Petition for Cancellation and therefore denies each and every allegation set forth therein.

13. Registrant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations set forth in Paragraph 13 of the Petition for Cancellation and therefore denies each and every allegation set forth therein.

14. Registrant denies the allegations set forth in Paragraph 14 of the Petition for Cancellation.

15. Registrant denies the allegations set forth in Paragraph 15 of the Petition for Cancellation.

16. Registrant denies the allegations set forth in Paragraph 16 of the Petition for Cancellation.

17. Registrant denies the allegations set forth in Paragraph 17 of the Petition for Cancellation.

18. Registrant denies the allegations set forth in Paragraph 18 of the Petition

for Cancellation.

19. Registrant hereby denies any and all other allegations of the Petition for Cancellation that have not been affirmatively admitted herein.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

1. Petitioner has not pleaded any law or facts that justify the cancellation of Registrant's mark, and consequently, Petitioner has failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

2. Petitioner's mark, is not likely to cause confusion, to cause mistake or deception with the marks allegedly owned by Petitioner. Trademark Examining Attorney assigned to the subject registration concluded on November 21, 2013 that there were no registered or pending marks, including those allegedly owned by Petitioner, that would bar registration of Registrant's mark. Please see Exhibit A. Simply because the respective marks have three letters in common does not mean that confusion, mistake or deception as to the source of the products is likely. The rearrangement of these letters creates a term that is distinctly different in appearance, sound and commercial impression from that of Petitioner's marks. Furthermore, Registrant's mark includes the additional terms "DELUXE" and the respective design elements that further preclude any likelihood of confusion.

3. Petitioner will not be damaged by the registration of Registrant's mark.

4. Petitioner's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the equitable defenses of estoppel, laches and acquiescence.

5. Registrant reserves the right to rely on other and further defenses as may be supported by facts to be determined through full and complete discovery and to amend

its Answer to assert such defenses.

WHEREFORE, Registrant prays that this Petition for Cancellation be dismissed with prejudice, and that Registrant be granted such other and further relief as the Board deems just and proper.

Date: December 8, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

/Paul D. Bianco/_____
Paul D. Bianco

FLEIT GIBBONS GUTMAN
BONGINI & BIANCO PL
21355 East Dixie Highway, Suite 115
Miami, Florida 33180
Ph: 305 830-2600
Fax: 305 830-2605
Email: tmmiami@fggbb.com

Attorneys for Registrant
Dabes, Ibrahim

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

It is hereby certified that a copy of this ANSWER PETITION FOR CANCELLATION was served by First Class Mail to M. Keith Blankenship, Esq., Da Vinci's Notebook, LLC, 10302 Bristow Center Dr. #52, Bristow, VA 20136, Attorney for Registrant, on this8th day of December 2014.

/Paul D. Bianco/_____
Paul D. Bianco

FLEIT GIBBONS GUTMAN
BONGINI & BIANCO PL

EXHIBIT A

To:	Dabes, Ibrahim (tmmiami@fggbb.com)
Subject:	U.S. TRADEMARK APPLICATION NO. 86025122 - AMY DELUXE - 7400-T13-409
Sent:	11/21/2013 3:54:37 PM
Sent As:	ECOM104@USPTO.GOV
Attachments:	Attachment - 1 Attachment - 2

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (USPTO)
OFFICE ACTION (OFFICIAL LETTER) ABOUT APPLICANT'S TRADEMARK APPLICATION

U.S. APPLICATION SERIAL NO. 86025122

MARK: AMY DELUXE

86025122

CORRESPONDENT ADDRESS:
PAUL D. BIANCO
FLEIT GIBBONS GUTMAN BONGINI & BIANCO PL
21355 E DIXIE HWY STE 115
MIAMI, FL 33180-1244

CLICK HERE TO RESPOND TO THIS LETTER
http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/teas/response_forms.jsp

APPLICANT: Dabes, Ibrahim

CORRESPONDENT'S REFERENCE/DOCKET NO :

7400-T13-409
CORRESPONDENT E-MAIL ADDRESS:
tmmiami@fggbb.com

OFFICE ACTION

STRICT DEADLINE TO RESPOND TO THIS LETTER

TO AVOID ABANDONMENT OF APPLICANT'S TRADEMARK APPLICATION, THE USPTO MUST RECEIVE APPLICANT'S COMPLETE RESPONSE TO THIS LETTER **WITHIN 6 MONTHS** OF THE ISSUE/MAILING DATE BELOW.

ISSUE/MAILING DATE: 11/21/2013

The referenced application has been reviewed by the assigned trademark examining attorney. Applicant must respond timely and completely to the issues below. 15 U.S.C. §1062(b); 37 C.F.R. §§2.62(a), 2.65(a); TMEP §§711, 718.03.

NO LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION FOUND

The trademark examining attorney has searched the Office's database of registered and pending marks and has found no conflicting marks that would bar registration under Trademark Act Section 2(d). TMEP §704.02; *see* 15 U.S.C. §1052(d).

TRANSLATION OF FOREIGN REGISTRATION REQUIRED

The applicant must submit an English translation of the foreign registration. 37 C.F.R. §2.34(a)(3)(ii); TMEP §1004.01(a)-(b). The translation should be signed by the translator. TMEP §1004.01(b).

PLEASE NOTE – Until a translation is provided, the examining attorney is unable to determine if the foreign registration contains a color claim. Since the foreign registration copy is not it color, it is impossible to tell. Accordingly, the examining attorney must presume that the mark in the foreign registration is in black and white. Thus, the following requirement is raised:

MARK DIFFERS ON FOREIGN REGISTRATION – MARK NOT IN COLOR

The drawing of the mark in the U.S. application is not acceptable because it does not correspond to the mark shown in the foreign registration. *See* 15 U.S.C. §1126(e); 37 C.F.R. §2.51(c). Specifically, the drawing in the U.S. application displays the mark in color and includes a color claim, but the foreign registration does not show the mark in color or otherwise indicate that particular colors are claimed as a feature of the mark.

The drawing of a mark in a U.S. application must be a substantially exact representation of the mark that appears in the foreign registration. 37 C.F.R. §2.51(c); *In re Hacot-Colombier*, 105 F.3d 616, 618-19, 41 USPQ2d 1523, 1525 (Fed. Cir. 1997); TMEP §§807.07(b), 1011.01; *see United Rum Merchs. Ltd. v. Distillers Corp. (S.A.)*, 9 USPQ2d 1481 (TTAB 1988). If the foreign registration includes a color claim, the U.S. application must include the same color claim; if the foreign registration does not include a color claim, the U.S. application may not contain a color claim. *See* TMEP §§807.07(d)(ii), 1011.01.

Therefore, applicant must clarify whether the foreign registration includes the same color claim set forth in the U.S. application by satisfying one of the following:

(1) If the foreign registration does not include a color claim or its legal equivalent, applicant must submit: (a) a new black-and-white drawing of the mark for the U.S. application that conforms to the mark shown in the foreign registration and which does not otherwise materially alter the mark in the U.S. application (amending the drawing of the mark in the U.S. application to agree with the mark in the foreign registration would not be considered a material alteration of the mark in this case); (b) a statement that color is not claimed as a feature of the mark in the U.S. application and deleting any color claim; and (c) an amended mark description that accurately describes all literal and design elements of the applied-for mark but does not reference color. *See* 37 C.F.R. §§2.37, 2.52(b)(1), 2.72(c); TMEP §§807.07(a)(i)-(b), 807.12(b), 1011.01.; or

(2) If the foreign registration includes a color claim or the legal equivalent, applicant must provide a statement to that effect, specifying the colors claimed and describing where they appear in the mark in the foreign registration. *See* TMEP §§807.07(b), 1011.01. Applicant must also submit a color photocopy of the foreign registration. TMEP §1011.01. If the foreign registration is not issued in color, applicant must provide evidence establishing that (a) the colors shown in the mark in the U.S. drawing are the same colors claimed in the foreign registration, and (b) the colors appear in the same locations within the mark in the U.S. drawing and foreign registration. *See*

TMEP §§807.12(b), 1011.01. Such evidence may include a written statement from the intellectual property office of the foreign country that indicates the colors claimed and their location in the mark in the foreign registration. The color claims and mark descriptions in both the U.S. application and foreign registration must agree. *See* TMEP §§807.07(d)(ii), 1011.01.

If applicant cannot satisfy the above requirements, and the application currently also contains a Trademark Act Section 1 filing basis, applicant may respond by deleting the Section 44 basis from the application and proceeding solely on the Section 1 basis. *See* 15 U.S.C. §§1051(a)-(b), 1126(d)-(e); 37 C.F.R. §2.35(b)(1); TMEP §806.04. A foreign registration certificate is not required for a Section 1(a) or 1(b) basis. *See* 15 U.S.C. §1051(a)-(b); TMEP §806.01(a)-(b). If the application is currently based solely on Section 44, applicant may amend the basis from Section 44 to Section 1(a) or 1(b), if applicant can satisfy the requirements for the chosen basis. *See* 15 U.S.C. §§1051(a)-(b), 1126(e); 37 C.F.R. §2.35(b)(1); TMEP §806.03.

IDENTIFICATION OF GOODS

The identification of goods includes "smoking articles," which is the heading of International Class 34. The purpose of such class headings is to indicate the subject matter and general scope of each international class of goods. *See* TMEP §1401.02(a). While such broad designations may be acceptable under the trademark laws and practice of other countries, the USPTO considers these headings too broad to identify goods in a U.S. application. *See In re Societe Generale des Eaux Minerales de Vittel S.A.*, 1 USPQ2d 1296, 1297-99 (TTAB 1986), *rev'd on other grounds* , 824 F.2d 957, 3 USPQ2d 1450 (Fed. Cir. 1987); TMEP §§1401.08, 1402.01 *et seq.*, 1402.07(a).

An identification of goods in a U.S. application must be specific, definite, clear, accurate, and concise. TMEP §1402.01; *see In re Societe Generale des Eaux Minerales de Vittel S.A.*, 1 USPQ2d at 1298-99. Identifications may be amended only to clarify or limit the goods and/or services, adding to or broadening the scope of the goods is not permitted. 37 C.F.R. §2.71(a); *see* TMEP §§1402.06 *et seq.* The scope of the identification for purposes of permissible amendments to class headings is limited by both the ordinary meaning of the words in and the international class of the heading. *See* TMEP §§1402.06(a), (b), 1402.07(a).

Therefore, applicant must amend the class heading to identify goods that fall within (1) the ordinary meaning of the words specified in the class heading, and (2) the international classification of the heading. *See* TMEP §§1402.06(a), (b), 1402.07(a).

Applicant may adopt the following identification of goods, if accurate:

International Class 34 – "Tobacco; smoking articles, namely, {please indicate the type of goods, e.g. cigarettes, cigars, smoking pipes, etc.}"

For assistance with identifying and classifying goods in trademark applications, please see the USPTO's online searchable *U.S. Acceptable Identification of Goods and Services Manual* at http://tess2.uspto.gov/netahtml/tidm.html. *See* TMEP §1402.04.

DISCLAIMER

Applicant must disclaim the descriptive wording "DELUXE" apart from the mark as shown because it merely describes a feature of applicant's goods. *See* 15 U.S.C. §§1052(e)(1), 1056(a); *DuoProSS*

Meditech Corp. v. Inviro Med. Devices, Ltd., 695 F.3d 1247, 1251, 103 USPQ2d 1753, 1755 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (quoting *In re Oppedahl & Larson LLP*, 373 F.3d 1171, 1173, 71 USPQ2d 1370, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2004)); *In re Steelbuilding.com*, 415 F.3d 1293, 1297, 75 USPQ2d 1420, 1421 (Fed. Cir. 2005); TMEP §§1213, 1213.03(a).

Specifically, terms "that are merely laudatory and descriptive of the alleged merit of a product are . . . regarded as being descriptive" because "[s]elf-laudatory or puffing marks are regarded as a condensed form of describing the character or quality of the goods." *DuoProSS Meditech Corp. v. Inviro Med. Devices, Ltd.*, 695 F.3d 1247, 1256, 103 USPQ2d 1753, 1759 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (quoting *In re The Boston Beer Co.*, 198 F.3d 1370, 1373, 53 USPQ2d 1056, 1058 (Fed. Cir. 1999)); TMEP §1209.03(k). In fact, "puffing, if anything, is *more* likely to render a mark merely descriptive, not less so." *DuoProSS Meditech Corp. v. Inviro Med. Devices, Ltd.*, 695 F.3d at 1256, 103 USPQ2d at 1759.

The term "DELUXE" means "high or highest in quality." See attached dictionary evidence. Because the term "DELUXE" attributes quality, it is laudatory, and thus merely descriptive of the goods.

A "disclaimer" is a statement in the application record that applicant does not claim exclusive rights to an unregistrable component of a mark; a disclaimer of unregistrable matter does not affect the appearance of the mark or physically remove disclaimed matter from the mark. *See Schwarzkopf v. John H. Breck, Inc.*, 340 F.2d 978, 978, 144 USPQ 433, 433 (C.C.P.A. 1965); TMEP §1213. An unregistrable component of a mark includes wording and designs that are merely descriptive or generic of an applicant's goods. 15 U.S.C. §1052(e); *see* TMEP §§1209.03(f), 1213.03 *et seq*. Such words need to be freely available for other businesses to market comparable goods or services and should not become the proprietary domain of any one party. *See Dena Corp. v. Belvedere Int'l, Inc.* , 950 F.2d 1555, 1560, 21 USPQ2d 1047, 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *In re Aug. Storck KG*, 218 USPQ 823, 825 (TTAB 1983).

If applicant does not provide the required disclaimer, the USPTO may refuse to register the entire mark. *See In re Stereotaxis Inc.*, 429 F.3d 1039, 1041, 77 USPQ2d 1087, 1089 (Fed. Cir. 2005); TMEP §1213.01(b).

Applicant may submit the following standardized format for a disclaimer:

No claim is made to the exclusive right to use "DELUXE" apart from the mark as shown.

TMEP §1213.08(a)(i); *see In re Owatonna Tool Co.*, 231 USPQ 493 (Comm'r Pats. 1983).

If applicant has questions regarding this Office action, please telephone or e-mail the assigned trademark examining attorney. All relevant e-mail communications will be placed in the official application record; however, an e-mail communication will not be accepted as a response to this Office action and will not extend the deadline for filing a proper response. *See* 37 C.F.R. §2.191; TMEP §§304.01-.02, 709.04-.05. Further, although the trademark examining attorney may provide additional explanation pertaining to the requirements in this Office action, the trademark examining attorney may not provide legal advice or statements about applicant's rights. *See* TMEP §§705.02, 709.06.

/Jason Paul Blair/
Examining Attorney
Law Office 104
Phone - (571) 272-8856
Fax - (571) 273-8856

jason.blair@uspto.gov

TO RESPOND TO THIS LETTER: Go to http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/teas/response_forms.jsp. Please wait 48-72 hours from the issue/mailing date before using the Trademark Electronic Application System (TEAS), to allow for necessary system updates of the application. For *technical* assistance with online forms, e-mail TEAS@uspto.gov. For questions about the Office action itself, please contact the assigned trademark examining attorney. **E-mail communications will not be accepted as responses to Office actions; therefore, do not respond to this Office action by e-mail.**

All informal e-mail communications relevant to this application will be placed in the official application record.

WHO MUST SIGN THE RESPONSE: It must be personally signed by an individual applicant or someone with legal authority to bind an applicant (i.e., a corporate officer, a general partner, all joint applicants). If an applicant is represented by an attorney, the attorney must sign the response.

PERIODICALLY CHECK THE STATUS OF THE APPLICATION: To ensure that applicant does not miss crucial deadlines or official notices, check the status of the application every three to four months using the Trademark Status and Document Retrieval (TSDR) system at http://tsdr.uspto.gov/. Please keep a copy of the TSDR status screen. If the status shows no change for more than six months, contact the Trademark Assistance Center by e-mail at TrademarkAssistanceCenter@uspto.gov or call 1-800-786-9199. For more information on checking status, see http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/process/status/.

TO UPDATE CORRESPONDENCE/E-MAIL ADDRESS: Use the TEAS form at http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/teas/correspondence.jsp.

Related Searches
Print shop deluxe d...
Deluxe checks
Ham radio deluxe s...
Free printshop softw...
Free download for a ...
Zuma deluxe
Free downloads prin...
Nero photoshow del...

Nearby Words
delusterant
delustering
delustrant
deluxe
delvaux
delvaux, paul
delve

Synonyms
first-class
exquisite
luxurious
exclusive
expensive
sumptuous
luscious

deluxe

Use Deluxe in a sentence

de·luxe [*duh*-**luhks**, -**loo ks**] Show IPA

adjective

1. of special elegance, sumptuousness, or fineness; high or highest in quality, luxury, etc.: *a deluxe hotel; a deluxe edition of Shakespeare bound in leather.*

adverb

2. in a luxurious or sumptuous manner: *We always travel deluxe.*

Also, **de luxe.**

Origin:
1810–20; < French *de luxe* of luxury

Related forms
su·per·de·luxe, ***adjective***

Example sentences

The base model comes sans air conditioning and power windows, but those

Some have those special annexed sun rooms that are part of the **deluxe** line.

And returns based on the **deluxe** model had a positive skew: large windfalls were

Long waits have always been part of the experience of acquiring a **deluxe** custom

EXPAND

Word Origin & History

Etymonline

deluxe
1819, from Fr. de luxe, lit. "of luxury," from L. luxus "excess, abundance."

Online Etymology Dictionary, © 2010 Douglas Harper
Cite This Source

Relevant Questions

What Is Turbo Tax Deluxe? How To Play Piano Deluxe How To Update Quicken
How To Troubleshoot A Delu How To Find A Deluxe Cinem What Is Turbotax Deluxe

Related Words

day coach	ouncer
epicurean	standard
luxe	superliner
ouncer	MORE

Matching Quote

"And if so
(And science ought to know)
We well may raise our heads
From weeding garden beds
And annotating books
To watch this end ***deluxe****."*

-Robert Frost

MORE

To:	Dabes, Ibrahim (tmmiami@fggbb.com)
Subject:	U.S. TRADEMARK APPLICATION NO. 86025122 - AMY DELUXE - 7400-T13-409
Sent:	11/21/2013 3:54:38 PM
Sent As:	ECOM104@USPTO.GOV
Attachments:	

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (USPTO)

IMPORTANT NOTICE REGARDING YOUR U.S. TRADEMARK APPLICATION

USPTO OFFICE ACTION (OFFICIAL LETTER) HAS ISSUED
ON **11/21/2013** FOR U.S. APPLICATION SERIAL NO. 86025122

Please follow the instructions below:

(1) TO READ THE LETTER: Click on this link or go to http://tsdr.uspto.gov, enter the U.S. application serial number, and click on "Documents."

The Office action may not be immediately viewable, to allow for necessary system updates of the application, but will be available within 24 hours of this e-mail notification.

(2) TIMELY RESPONSE IS REQUIRED: Please carefully review the Office action to determine (1) how to respond, and (2) the applicable response time period. Your response deadline will be calculated from **11/21/2013** (*or sooner if specified in the Office action*). For information regarding response time periods, see http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/process/status/responsetime.jsp.

Do NOT hit "Reply" to this e-mail notification, or otherwise e-mail your response because the USPTO does NOT accept e-mails as responses to Office actions. Instead, the USPTO recommends that you respond online using the Trademark Electronic Application System (TEAS) response form located at http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/teas/response_forms.jsp.

(3) QUESTIONS: For questions about the contents of the Office action itself, please contact the assigned trademark examining attorney. For *technical* assistance in accessing or viewing the Office action in the Trademark Status and Document Retrieval (TSDR) system, please e-mail TSDR@uspto.gov.

WARNING

Failure to file the required response by the applicable response deadline will result in the

ABANDONMENT of your application. For more information regarding abandonment, see http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/basics/abandon.jsp**.**

PRIVATE COMPANY SOLICITATIONS REGARDING YOUR APPLICATION: Private companies **not** associated with the USPTO are using information provided in trademark applications to mail or e-mail trademark-related solicitations. These companies often use names that closely resemble the USPTO and their solicitations may look like an official government document. Many solicitations require that you pay "fees."

Please carefully review all correspondence you receive regarding this application to make sure that you are responding to an official document from the USPTO rather than a private company solicitation. All official USPTO correspondence will be mailed only from the "United States Patent and Trademark Office" in Alexandria, VA; or sent by e-mail from the domain "@uspto.gov." For more information on how to handle private company solicitations, see http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/solicitation_warnings.jsp.